

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Response is in response to the Office Action dated June 9, 2005. Claims 1-52 are pending in the present application.

In the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-52 are subject to a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121. In particular, the Examiner stated that

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Species of claims 1-5, 9, 13-24, 35-38, 42, 47-52, directed to an embodiment wherein the service providers comprise video rental chains, and wherein providing a repository database includes receiving different customer information, storing movie title information, making the movie title information accessible by the applications and receiving movie title information from movie distributors.**
- II. Species 1, 6, 26-35, 39, directed to an embodiment wherein the central application provides a notification service.**
- III. Species 1, 7, 8, 35, 40, 41, directed to an embodiment of registering the applications as clients and making access to the database secure through encryption.**
- IV. Species 1, 10, 11, 35, 43, 44, directed to an embodiment of receiving queries from the applications, analyzing data in the database, and returning a recommended list in response to the queries.**
- V. Species 1, 12, 13, 25, 35, 46, directed to an embodiment wherein the service providers provide online retail services**
- VI. Species 35, 45, directed to an embodiment of storing customer credential reports, and allowing customer to request reports directly from the central application to challenge the report's validity.**

The Examiner stated "Applicant is required under 35 USC §121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claim shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently claims 1, 26 and 47 and are generic...Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of the

allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.” Attorney for the Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s confirmation of the above during a telephone interview on July 11, 2005.


Applicant hereby provisionally elects Species I, claims 1-5, 9, 13-24, 35-38, 42, 47-52.

Applicant respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction and requests reconsideration and modification of the requirement. Applicant traverses the requirement for restriction because the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions under MPEP 802.01 require “a serious burden on the Examiner.” It is respectfully submitted, that the Examiner has not met the prima facie showing of a serious burden. The Examiner admits that claim 1 is generic, and there has been no showing of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field the search that would result in a serious burden.

Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 493-4540

July 11, 2005

Date